



## CO-OPERATION IN DESIGN.

Discussion at the Eighth Informal Conference held at the Royal Institute of British Architects, 16th May 1917.

Mr. ALFRED W. S. CROSS, M.A.Cantab. [F.], in the Chair.

Mr. A. R. JEMMETT [F.] read the following Paper:—

The proceedings of this Conference, indeed the very existence of this Institute, may be taken as evidence that we recognise the advantages of co-operation, but I suggest that our somewhat half-hearted co-operative action has hitherto been directed more towards safeguarding our material and professional interests than to widening our mental horizon and quickening our spiritual perception. The principle of intelligent co-operation between those concerned in actual building operations—between the architect and the decorator, the architect and the craftsman—is now fully recognised; but the way in which this principle should be put into practice appears to be a question on which there is more to be said. I hope it will be said by those better qualified than I am to say it.

This is one aspect of co-operation, and a very important one; but that to which I would draw attention is the need for closer and fuller co-operation between architects themselves during the conception and development of their designs before building co-operation has a chance to begin. More particularly would I point to the immense value of a real spirit of co-operation and mutual assistance; to its widening effect on the mental outlook, its stimulating effect on the imagination, and its general tendency towards raising the standard of architecture and the repute of those who practise it. I submit that the possibilities of this form of co-operation have not been sufficiently explored. This may be partly due to racial characteristics, and partly to the fact that we are just emerging from a period of unrestricted individualism in design, and may be still susceptible to its influence. During this period genius dwelt apart, and wrought in splendid isolation, jealously guarding its trade secrets, as deeds of apprenticeship testify. Each designer was a law unto himself. Everyone went his own way simply because it was his own way, indifferent, apparently, to his destination, and priding himself on the fact that, whatever else his work might or might not be, at least it was his own. "A poor ill-favoured thing, sir, but mine own." The mere fact that it was entirely "mine

own" down to the last cupboard-door handle or case-ment fastener was evidently considered ample excuse, or even justification, for its poverty and ill-favour. Each man for himself and the devil take the hindmost adopted as a rule of artistic conduct created an atmosphere of mutual jealousy and veiled hostility in which it was actually possible to refuse to publish one's drawings for fear that others might learn something from them. So was knowledge spread and architecture advanced.

The perverted morality of this golden rule need not detain us. Obviously the devil would take the foremost, not the hindmost, by any ethical standard conceivable now. What concerns us, however, is the lack of intelligence that failed to perceive that we are all members of the same body, and cannot flourish individually unless the whole body flourishes collectively, and that if we fail to support the body we ourselves must ultimately perish. It concerns us because we are faced with the result, the inevitable reaction of the lowered vitality of the ill-nourished body upon the health of its individual members.

Granted that we now breathe a more congenial atmosphere, and that a more enlightened self-interest has taught us that we can best serve our own interests by serving those of the body to which we belong, that the more we give the more we receive; but are we yet fully persuaded that isolation is mental and spiritual starvation, and that the quality of a design is of more importance than its authorship?

To those who still hold the opinion that each man's design is, and must be, entirely his own this question of co-operation may present some difficulty. The mere idea of a collective concept, or of co-operating to produce a concept, may suggest a paradox or a contradiction in terms. I think it is March Philipps who points out that architecture is the most intellectualised of all the arts. If, bearing this in mind, and accepting the view that it is also a communal product expressing certain aspects of communal life, we examine the nature of our work, the conditions under which it is carried out, and the mental processes involved, the difficulty may, perhaps, disappear. We

may even arrive at the conclusion that no man's design ever is, or can be, entirely his own, or, to be more precise, that no architectural design ever is, or can be, the outcome of a single mind.

We have to remember that, although under the impulse to create we may all visualise castles in the air, yet that as a matter of fact such personal mental concepts rarely materialise. It may be possible to suddenly create, to visualise instantaneously, and straight away to go and build just the one building that can express the mood of the moment—it may be possible, but the point is, we don't do it. We do not get the chance. We may have the impulse and the vision, but not the opportunity. A procedure allowed to the poet or the musician is denied to the architect. He can only design the buildings that other people require, and when they require them. He finds his opportunity for self-expression limited by the fact that both the impulse to build, the nature of the building and the germ of the idea for its design originate with those who need the building, not with those who build it; as well as by the further fact that accommodation, site, cost, and so forth, are all predetermined and presented to him as factors in a problem he is called upon to solve. Regarding our work from this point of view—the solution of a given predetermined problem—we may be disposed to admit that co-operation in its solution is possible.

There may be buildings so small and so simple that the solution of any problem they present is obvious, but there are others so large and so complex that it can only be arrived at slowly by analysis leading to synthesis, a process of gradually building up or evolving a mental concept which must be not only complete in itself but the one that presents the right solution of the particular problem in hand. When we consider the nature and the amount of the preliminary analytic work required before we are in a position to proceed to a synthesis; the danger of a premature synthesis, under pressure of the time limit; the number of possible solutions that present themselves, and the amount of judgment required to choose between them, we may be prepared to admit that co-operation is not only possible but desirable. Indeed, when we further consider the rapid advance of knowledge, the growing complexity of society, the increase of the factors with which we have to deal, the new problems involved in the tendency to build ever larger and more complex buildings, to bring groups of buildings, and even whole towns, within the scope of a single architectural synthesis; when we realise, in short, that architecture is an art that is only in its infancy, we may be willing to admit that co-operation is not only desirable but necessary—if only by way of division of labour.

The practical advantages of division of labour are obvious. Considerable progress has been made, particularly in America, by the association—in partnership or otherwise—of men of different aptitudes, each

of whom specialises on his own branch of the problem, but I am more interested for the moment in those who combine to study every aspect of the problem together, and to produce a joint solution. When two or three are gathered together, sharing the same mental outlook or attitude towards their art, and work together to the same ends, they mutually strengthen, stimulate and inspire one another, and personalities seem to mingle, melt and fuse into a something greater than any one of them, a collective personality—the personality of the group. This joint personality appears able to produce a complete mental concept—a joint solution of the problem which is not that of any one member of the group, which is different from that which any one member would have produced alone, and which, in my view, may be, should be, and generally is, better than that which any one member could have produced alone. A design embodying such a concept seems to reflect the collective personality of the group, not the individuality of any one person, and to be governed by a dominating idea, not by a dominant mind.

This suggestion of a collective personality may appear fantastic and quite unnecessary to those who hold that a design must be the outcome of a single mind. They may prefer to take the view that any such group of men is sure to be dominated by one individual, the real creator of the design, to whom the others are really assistants; and that any improvement in the quality of the design would be due to their influence, which seems to point to the value of assistance, provided it is co-operative.

We never seem to have considered how far our work may be simplified and its quality improved by sympathetic and intelligent co-operative assistance. We do not know how to use our assistants. If we do not exploit them we still continue to regard them too much as draughtsmen, or even as clerks, and too little as assistant designers. Instead of taking them into our confidence, opening our minds to them and discussing the problem with them as man to man—recognising that our greater experience may be our only claim to lead—instead of using them to help us to analyse the programme, study the various factors of the problem, examine the potentialities of various possible solutions, and generally assist us in clarifying and arranging our ideas and arriving at our general concept of the scheme, we bring them in as draughtsmen when the general outline of the scheme is completed and the chance for co-operative assistance is passed. I wonder if we quite realise how much we lose by this procedure, and how much the younger generation loses. The study of completed results may be advantageous to the student, but it is not the same thing as watching and taking part in the mental processes whereby they are obtained. The assistant, either as ghost or as draughtsman, must disappear, and be replaced by the assistant architect, trained in the schools to co-operate, if we are to pass on our knowledge, build up a tradition of method, and arrive at

that general mental outlook in common so necessary to the advancement of architecture.

Possibly this brings us to the real reason why we do not co-operate more often. Not because we will not, but because we cannot, because we have no traditional method of working and no mental outlook common to us all. We cannot walk together cheering and sustaining one another by the way, because we walk in different ways. Small groups, perhaps, go the same way—possibly arm in arm, co-operating as they go—but these groups have not yet agreed on any one way in which they can all walk together. This way must be found, even if we all have to modify our views, and trust less to our own unaided sense of direction in order to find it; for it is the way of progress by co-operation in design.

THE CHAIRMAN: Mr. Jemmett has given us much food for reflection. I think the position he takes up as to architects sharing the same mental attitude to produce the same mental concept, as he describes it, is unattainable unless, to begin with, architects are educated together. What I think an ideal education for an architect is for his preliminary training to be received in common with the preliminary art training of the painter and the sculptor. If Alfred Stevens is right in the assertion that there is only one Art, you do not want to have separate educational establishments; and until the student, whether he be architect or painter or sculptor, is in a position to begin specialising in his own work, I think you will only get that same mental attitude. Mr. Jemmett's remarks as to the divergent road taken by architects will apply much more strongly to the divergent road taken by painters and sculptors educated in a different direction. You would only get that unity in the Arts if you educated your embryonic artists, to a certain point, together. In a school of that kind you would have an interchange of ideas when the men are young. It is extremely difficult, as far as my limited experience goes, to work really comfortably and profitably with a man you have never met before in your life, a man whose ideas may coincide with your own or be diametrically opposed to them. Supposing, for instance, you had occasion to call in the services of a sculptor, or a decorative artist, you would naturally call in the man of whose training and sympathies you knew something. It is rarely that you get to know a man, his character and idiosyncrasies when you come to know him only late in life. Early youth is the time for forming friendships: at that period there would be mutual criticism: the sculptor would criticise the architect's designs, and the young architect would criticise the sculptor's work, and the painter would criticise both. I think this interchange of ideas would be a most valuable system in education, for it would encourage the viewing of things from different standpoints. Therefore the preliminary training of all men in the artistic profession should, it seems to me, be a sort of joint one. Of course, Mr. Jemmett has more than

once laid stress on the difficulties of architects themselves, those who have been brought up in different schools of thought finding it difficult to co-operate. I think that is very true. Surely some day there will be a great Government School of National Art, subsidised by the State, perhaps, but not necessarily, for I think it ought not to be directed by the State, as far as the curriculum of study is concerned. Something on the lines of the *Ecole des Beaux-Arts* is desirable here. There the students of the first two years work together: each has to attend the same classes, and they are all imbued with the same ideas, and that, I think, is productive, on the whole, of a good result.

MR. H. V. LANCHESTER [F.]: The only qualification I feel I have for speaking this afternoon is the fact that I am one of those architects who have worked persistently in collaboration with others. There are men here who perhaps share with me that qualification. I have only gone in that direction to a very limited extent compared with the possibilities in the future. In so far as I have pursued that course, I feel that both myself and those with whom I have worked have benefited very greatly: in getting our outlook broadened, in conceiving larger general principles of design, thus making up, in some degree, for the limitations of what I regard as a very unsatisfactory education, which I think we all admit to have had in the past. I do feel that there is considerably better hope for us in the future—and, I trust, in the near future—with regard to preliminary training in our art. I think a good deal of confusion exists with regard to art training. I would like to state the point of view which was put to me, comparatively recently, by M. Horta, who was over here, and who was given control of the *Beaux-Arts* School in Brussels. "I do not pretend," he said, "to try to teach people an art. What I want to do—and I like to begin with children of about four or five years of age—is to teach them to observe, to see everything, and to see it thoroughly, to see everything there is about it. Those who grow up seeing everything there is to be seen, if they have got any artistic quality in them at all, it is bound to come out." We know that when M. Horta had that school under his control he insisted that his pupils and those who were working with him should see things absolutely. He began with the simplest thing, for the young you must begin with simple things. He began with a pea, and asked what there was to see about it. Somebody said it was round. Then he rolled it along, and asked, "Is it round?" Then the pupils began to look at it more closely, and found it was not round, that it had various subtleties of shape. Later he took them to the growth of plants, and asked them what they could see: how they grow, their connections, the shape of the leaves, the veining, and so on. Then he passed to animals, and from them to the human form: how the muscles are half hidden and half revealed by the skin and tissues. Finally he

said: "If they have got any art in them they can now develop it." It may strike you as an extreme view. But it brings out the beginnings of an understanding on the basis of which a man can build up his art. It seems to me, however, that when he has got some way on that programme the architect has to go a great deal further. He has, as Mr. Jemmett said, the communal basis of his work to consider, its function, its mixture. It has, underlying it, some sort of utilitarian purpose. I mean "utilitarian" in the broadest sense: it has to express that purpose in a beautiful way and in a rational way. When we come to these things it becomes, to most of us—because we have been trained in this haphazard way—a very difficult task. We worry, and say, "I know there is something at the back of this, but how is it to be expressed?" I candidly admit that, in one's excursions into these things, nine times out of ten one arrives at the conclusion that one is off the track. Sometimes one has even put it into brick and stone, and only then realises it is off the track. I think if we can get that first observation and train one's ideas of beauty, and subsequently of logic, and train one's ideas of expressing need, we shall much less frequently get off the track than we have been in the habit of doing. If we had this preliminary study on such lines as that we should instinctively come together and be able to see things more or less in the same way, much more so than we have been in the habit of doing. The sort of training we have had disorganises everything. I am particularly thinking of our competitions and things of that sort. If you look into the average competition in England, you see that in nine cases out of ten the designs have gone off the track, and the only result to hope for would be to pick out a design which is less off the track than most of the others, and hope that the man who did it possesses the logic and the faculty of getting nearer to a solution than the others; and when he carries out the work that he will be able to get a little nearer still. If we had that basis of knowledge as to how these functions were to be logically and beautifully expressed we should be able to see much better what our fellow artists were driving at, and we should have a consensus of opinion as to how the thing had arrived at the right solution. If we had that education we should be able to gain much more from the co-operation which Mr. Jemmett suggests than under our present methods. But I believe that even with our present defective faculties—and I think we must all recognise that our faculties, through lack of exercise in our youth, are defective—we shall be able to gain something by co-operation with each other with regard to design, particularly with regard to our interpretation of the expression of needs into terms of beauty. I have always felt that myself. I have always felt that criticism from the man whose opinion and training I have valued has never failed to pick out some weakness. I do not say the remedy he proposes is usually the remedy I should choose myself, but it has nearly always proved to me that

there is a weakness somewhere which has to be gone into and rectified.

Another advantage that I can see in such a system of co-operation would be a definite continuity in tradition. We see too often that our best men seem to leave no school behind them. There may perhaps have been one or two men working with them who have benefited by their brilliance and their highly trained intellect. But supposing those best men got men, who were more or less sympathetic with their attitude, in close contact and working steadily with them, and that every new comer was most carefully chosen as one who was sympathetic in his method, it seems to me we might expect to see continuity from generation to generation, the carrying on of a very high tradition. We should then, as it were, organise our work, so as to get the best out of the men at our disposal, and so get better work all round.

PROFESSOR LETHABY [F.]: I feel great sympathy with Mr. Jemmett's paper, and also with Mr. Lanchester's delightfully modest speech—a modesty which I would like to share, if I could. Of course, what I may call "group sympathy"—and the bigger the group becomes, the better—is an enormous thing. All productive work can only properly, I think, come from what you may call group sympathy: I mean in any school of literature, or any new movement in painting, or that sort of thing. But Mr. Jemmett seemed to suggest a little more than that: he suggested a sort of Committee Architecture. That, it seems to me, is nearly impracticable. There might be a discussion, certainly, on equal grounds, but it seems to me there must be a captain of the ship. And what I have called Committee Architecture, apart from group sympathy—a thing which is of absolute value—seems to me impossible. But the co-operation on the other plan which he mentioned—namely, the association of divers gifts—seems to me to be most practical, and most necessary now in relation to big complex building problems. I hope I make that clear.

That is really all I have to say on the main question. It is one line of necessary growth—a great and essential thing, I feel sure; and until we get more into the habit of real association in producing big works we shall not move very far or do very much. I am sure that is one line of advance. I agree, so far, entirely.

If I may now make a little cavilling personal note, I would say we are getting to talk a new cant language: this talk about a "concept," "a solution of the problem," "expression in terms of beauty" and such things, which sound awfully well. But, first of all, it is difficult for an ordinary person to know what is meant; and, secondly, what does it all amount to? I do not care if a thing has a conception; my street is full of conceptions; we should prefer common-sense. I do not know of any modern building in which this wonderful "expression in terms of beauty" justifies itself—what are "terms of beauty"? Therefore why do we confuse ourselves with this grand and unreal



language? The people who do the work of the world—doctors, scientific men, engineers and so on—do not talk language of that sort, and it is time we should drop it. Until we do we are only again building up artificialities which may betray us.

MR. LANCHESTER: If I may speak again, Sir, the expressions Professor Lethaby refers to may be considered *clichés*, but there is something which it is a little difficult to convey in other words. I think what we want to say is that there are certain things which seem lacking in the English handling of architectural problems compared with the Continental handling. One of them is this—and that is really at the root of what I want to say—that we fail, relatively, in putting into concrete form the expression of a purpose and intention in a building. And it has appeared—rightly or wrongly—that in some of the Continental schools they have, more or less, given their students a lead in the methods, the short-cuts, as it were, to get this expression into the character of the plan, the massing and the general treatment of their building. When we compare British building with Continental building in those respects—let us leave out all the other things that we do not like and that we think are frivolous and unbeautiful about Continental buildings, and get down to the broad things—we find they have the sort of feeling which should come into the mind of people when they are occupied in and about such a building. They do seem to have got, in some way, a sort of system of expressing, by the disposition of the component parts of a building, the character of the building. We recognise it, perhaps, in the case of our churches, a certain restraint and dignity about them; but we do not seem to have recognised it in many of our other public buildings. We see a building down the street, but we cannot tell until we meet the Curator that it is a museum: we see another building, but we do not know what is its purpose until we get inside it. There is a stage in a man's career when he must begin to realise that he must think first what the function of the building is, before he attempts his design, to make that building an excuse for an architectural conception. What I mean, I know Mr. Jemmett will put into better language than I have.

MR. ROBERT ATKINSON [F.]: I am very much interested in Mr. Jemmett's Paper. I think on exactly the same lines, but there are a few small details on which I differ. I was very much interested, too, in Professor Lethaby's discussion on sympathy. He talked about group sympathy, which I am very pleased to hear he agrees with, because a very few years ago group sympathy seemed to be scorned and sat upon because it was not individual. People seemed to think that if everybody was turned out of the same mould, the same school, individualisation would be killed. Apparently, that idea seems to have died a natural death, and now we think it is an advantage that people should think in the same direc-

tion. And in that direction would come co-operation. It could not be avoided, because people would all think more or less in the same way, and would think the same things beautiful. I am not sure I like the idea of a Committee of Architecture, as Professor Lethaby says, because here you would have a group of men, perhaps working and walking in the same direction; but some of them are jealous, and one or two of them must be dominant. Rather than not be dominant, they might not put out their best work. So in a Committee of Architecture you might not get the best work, though in theory you ought to. Then there is the word "expression," which I often use myself. It seems to me that that combines all the functions of architecture: its use, its construction, and everything else. It seems to me beauty is merely the measure of the man who looks at it. A person who understands these things looking at a fine building would see in it beauties which even the designer did not intend. It is, perhaps, a question of education along certain lines, and it is only visible to architects: the man-in-the-street is not capable of forming an opinion upon the subtleties themselves: the differences between a warehouse and a store, and so on. To the architect, however, they will be perfectly apparent.

Turning to individualism, which I think is now dead, very recently individualism was a thing which ran mad: every person seemed to think he could not be individual unless he had an individual, a peculiar, style as well. We see Colcutt doing Plateresque, and Norman Shaw doing Tudor, and someone else doing Dutch gables, and there was an idea that no one else must do it. If in those days some tradesman went and asked five or six architects for a building, and each gave him their style, they could not all be solutions of the poor tradesman's problem, and so he would have to live during the rest of his life in a building which externally looked Gothic, or something else, but did not fit his requirements. I think the beginning of a design must be from the inside, from the tradesman's point of view: if it does not fit his shop or his millinery business, it is a useless piece of architecture. But, as I have said, I am glad that is dying out: we are now getting more at any rate on level lines, and trying to get more expression than individualism.

And I think that, after all, we come back to the root of the problem, and that is education, because co-operation must be fostered by education: that is really where it would begin: it is where its origin comes. And I might say, as a young architect, that we feel very strongly that we ought not to be bound by any State schools, or London County Council regulations. We want to be architects and work our own education and our own salvation. We do not want to be State-subsidised at all. We do not want to be ordered about and work under hide-bound restrictions, because that would kill architecture in a very short period. I think that the more the architect's educa-

tion expands, the more co-operation we shall get, because these men will see each other in the schools, and will know each other's capacities. They will form friendships, and the friendships will be as much friendships of admiration as are friendships in the ordinary way, such things will naturally bring co-operation. Thus, eventually, practically everybody will be working on the same lines, and architecture will become a national style, instead of an individualistic one.

MR. D. B. NIVEN [F.]: I think we are rather too much inclined to work in water-tight compartments as architects: we do not come sufficiently into contact with painters and sculptors and other artistic people, or even in contact with our clients as much as we should do. We have our own ideas, and, too often, I fear, force them down our clients' throats. If we were more in touch with life—and after the war we must be more in touch with life—we would benefit all round. If these conferences are to be continued would it not be possible to get painters and sculptors to attend them as well as architects. The series of conferences have been excellent, and they have been doing a great deal of good in a quiet way. Co-operation is in the air: everyone should co-operate or combine in the future more than formerly. It is not merely a case of working in partnership. In America they have gone in for co-operation more than we have here, and in that country you find architects combining with engineers, and even with lawyers. Of course, in London it is immensely difficult to do work, and it would be a good thing if sometimes an architect had a lawyer as a partner to steer him clear of some of the pitfalls. In fact, only after an architect has worked all round the subject, and found what are the limitations and difficulties, can he start with his design; and then he is so hampered, and has had the stuffing so knocked out of him, that it is difficult to do anything. The manufacturers in this country are, I know, thinking a good deal about co-operation: they realise that business cannot be conducted in the future in the same way as formerly, and they are already finding out how best they can combine. Mr. Lloyd George recently told some of the Labour people they must have audacity; that everything was possible in the future. The world is in a state of flux, and many things we have been almost afraid to suggest will be considered and will be perfectly possible hereafter. Co-operation, however, is sometimes a compromise. When two men are working together, and they consult one another, and are both men of strong ideas, it is not always a source of strength, sometimes it is a source of weakness: there is a levelling-up, but there is also a levelling-down. The critical faculty comes out in co-operation—but sometimes it is dangerous. A man with an intuitive sense may be bowled over by criticism, and, although he feels that logically the criticism may be sound, he yet feels within himself that there are more than two sides to the question. Some-

times, too, you find a man, even when not working in partnership, who may not even be a good draughtsman but who is influencing for good his surroundings, and the young men who pass through his hands, and that his personality is impressed on everything that comes out of his office, on everything his assistants do.

Some partners co-operate in a particular way: one partner has certain qualities, and the other certain other qualities, and they early recognise their strength and their weakness. In other cases you find partners working in a more individual manner: where one man gets a job, he leads in that job, and but rarely consults his partner: the partner always being there to be consulted; and even though, on account of twentieth century conditions, they may find it desirable to work in partnership, yet they retain their own individuality, and thoroughly master their individual jobs, merely having their partner in reserve. When groups of men are working together, they influence one another, and sometimes their tastes have much in common after such co-operation.

THE CHAIRMAN: Do you think that would be the case if the partners are from different schools?

MR. NIVEN: I think they are bound to come closer together from sympathetic relationship after some time.

PROFESSOR LETHABY: May I turn for a moment to this question raised by Mr. Lanchester? It is very interesting. The French carry forward a great body of tradition in their architectural work. For myself, I think they are both the greatest and, in a sense, the most backward in the world now. Of course, they carry forward this wonderful body of experience in all their work: in planning, in their own methods of workmanship, and even in the school methods of drawing. It is a wonderful system of getting rapid work, direct work, and so on. But along with it—partly because they have never, as yet, apparently been broken up by what we were broken up, by the so-called "Gothic Revival"—they are drifting into scepticism. They still carry forward their presuppositions, and along with the greatest skill and gift and attainment they are, to me, the weakest in æsthetic doctrine: they are fifty years behind, except in the teaching of Viollet-le-Duc, of course. Mine is an individual view, and I am probably wrong: it is that the French are at once enormously in advance, and carry forward this valuable body of splendid tradition, and alongside with it is a body of exceeding thin intellectual and architectural twaddle meaning nothing at all. And to take up a work like that of Guadet is simply to come upon an astounding revelation. He knows everything in the world, yet alongside the most perfect and penetrating criticism on architecture, the selection of examples, and so on, you come upon the most unbelievable imbecility in the next page. And it all goes down in the Dictionary of Architecture as, apparently, of the same value. They have not gone through the stage of disruption which we

have, and which the Germans have, and which the Belgians have, and which more or less the Americans have too, although they are founding very largely on the French. It is on that I venture to protest, the taking over of the French body of doctrine into our schools alongside of their magnificent tradition of practice. Let us not take over their false aesthetics and their talking about concepts, and programmes, and so on. These matters should be approached, I think, as the designing of a battleship is approached. A house contains other things: it needs to be finished with skins of plaster and, perhaps, wall-papers, and, possibly, hung with pictures: but the problem is essentially the same as that of the battleship, and we are not doing sufficient because we do not look directly at the problems. If we had considered perfect cottage building during the last hundred years, we might have been able to build a cottage, which we certainly cannot at present. Most people live in small houses. If we had looked at the problem of house-building, we might have been able to build a small house such as we would like to live in. But nobody can build a sound house. There are still such small things as cracked ceilings and damp walls, smoky grates, bad floors, draught and dark.

Mr. NIVEN: I have been privileged to do some work in France, and one finds there that the ordinary workman has a knowledge of tradition. If you leave anything out in a drawing, we know the mess the British workman makes of it. But the French workman cannot go wrong on certain lines: it is in him. And we find the people generally much interested in architecture. If anything new is going on in a town, the people make time to see how it is going on, and expressions of opinion are clearly given. They also are interested in the history of the subject. A man who was engaged in breaking stones by a roadside began telling me one day about the Field of the Cloth of Gold and the times of Francis I. and Henry VIII. The ordinary working man in France has an amazing knowledge of artistic things, of history and of tradition.

Mr. JEMMETT: In reference to what has just been said, I was sketching Notre Dame from the quay, when an ordinary workman came along and asked me whether I had noticed that one tower was slightly wider than the other? He seemed to know all about Notre Dame. I have been told that the Paris workman is a thorough craftsman in his way, and in some respects is far ahead of the English.

I was interested in what Mr. Lanchester said as to the importance of cultivating the faculty of observation. If we had been taught to know what a thing was when we saw it, we should learn, in time, what architecture was when we saw it: we should no longer have ideas derived from incorrect observation. If we co-operated more we should not be so often misled by

seeing a thing from our own incomplete point of view. I take it that architecture can be seen from an infinite number of points, and that the view from each point can be correct, so far as it goes. But if we want a comprehensive all-round view we have to see through the other man's mind too, as well as see more accurately with our own eyes. One can only see one aspect of a building at one time, and if you stay on that side, and do not walk round the building, you never get anything like a complete view. And where we find a difficulty in gathering what the other person is talking about, and the expressions he uses seem meaningless to us, it is perhaps because we do not realise what the other man sees from his point of view.

Professor Lethaby commented on some terms I used. In particular he referred to the term "concept." It is a word I do not use as a rule. I used it on the present occasion just because I thought others would understand the term, and so realise what I was driving at. I always think there is something at the back of the terms a man uses. If he talks about expressing his "ideas in terms of architecture," it is because he has ideas and thinks architecture a suitable medium for their expression. Another man may not think architecture can express ideas, or if he thinks it can he may think it ought not to do so. To him this expression may be meaningless or even misleading. But as it happens I want to express my ideas about life, and I certainly feel that the whole truth has not been stated when anyone tells me that in talking of expressing my "ideas in terms of architecture" I am simply using a catch, and I think many architects at the present day have this feeling. We need very much the power and method of expression. Many people will tell you there is no finer medium than architecture for the expression of ideas, but they do not tell you how to use the medium to this end. What we are working for is to find out how to do it; to establish the method by which we can express ideas and feelings, as in music or literature. That is a point on which French architecture appeals to me more than the English. It is not a question of taste. What matters to me is that which is behind it all: the system, the method, the philosophy by which the ideas are expressed. With regard to "group personality"—what Professor Lethaby calls "Committee architecture"—my feeling was that most of the great buildings of antiquity, from the Parthenon to Notre Dame, express rather the personality of a group than that of a single individual.

THE CHAIRMAN: This is a very comprehensive subject, and we have dealt with only a small part of it to-day. Looming in the distance there is the co-operation of the architect with the structural engineer, and all sorts of similar matters, and I think the consideration of that aspect, at some time, would be a very beneficial thing. We are extremely obliged to Mr. Jemmett and Professor Lethaby.

## ARCHITECTURAL EDUCATION FOR ARCHITECTS AND THE PUBLIC.

By W. S. PURCHON, M.A. [A.].

ONCE more the reports of the R.I.B.A. Informal Conferences make one regret inability to be present at meetings which must clearly have been most inspiring. The period immediately preceding the war was an extremely critical one for architecture and architectural education in this country, and from these conferences it may surely be inferred that the crisis is passing, and that we shall not resume the *status quo ante bellum*. The dangers in those days which now seem so far away were that present needs might be sacrificed to past methods, that external appearances might be considered the ultimate aim of our art, that we might be so carried away by our enthusiasm for brilliant draughtsmanship that we should forget the actual solid building, that we should literally grasp at the shadow and lose the substance, and that real education in architecture would be sacrificed to the acquiring of a fatal facility in the representation of fashionable façades.

During this period those who upheld the then discredited theory that beauty in architecture is more than skin deep, that in fact the highest form of beauty in our art is impossible apart from sheer efficiency, were in an apparently hopeless minority; but these conferences provide a clear indication that the value of the more thorough study which they advocated is gradually being understood and appreciated.

The war has undoubtedly brought many into contact with the hard facts of life in a manner which they had never previously experienced; it seems clear that much that was shallow and flippant in pre-war days must give way to a sterner and grander vision, and in architecture as well as in the arts of sculpture, painting, literature and the theatre we may surely look forward with confidence to a period of great achievement as a result of this finer and nobler outlook. If, however, our art is to come into its own in the years which are yet to be, it will largely be as a result of our taking the right steps during the plastic period which is coming, if indeed it is not already with us. The architectural problems of the future will not be easy ones; this at least will be obvious to all who are studying the tendencies of modern scientific building; and architecture will take its rightful place in life to the extent to which it grapples seriously with the problems put before it. Smart draughtsmanship will not save the situation, painfully accurate delineation of shadows will be of little avail, while the musty atmosphere of the early years of the last century must be replaced by a more bracing air if our art is to become vital.

What, then, shall we do? How, then, shall we train our students? The answer to the first question is, I think, that we should try to realise as clearly and fully as we can the changes which are inevitably coming over our art, and to the second that we should

so equip our students that they will be in a position to tackle the new problems in a serious manner. We have made an excellent start by abandoning our Preliminary Examination, and the path is thus open for us to stiffen up gradually the conditions under which candidates may take the Intermediate. It will, in the near future, be of increasing importance that a good standard of general education is reached before professional education is commenced.

In the actual teaching of architecture modern methods of construction and modern ideas of sanitation should play a large part. The architects of the future must be able to understand ferro-concrete and its possibilities; they must not look upon it as something provided by someone else, something which in some way or other they are to hide away in the building they have previously designed. They must understand something about ventilation, heating, lighting and acoustics, and here again they must realise that these are essential parts of architecture, not something added to their building by a "sort of sergeant chappie."

The study of the history of architecture should be undertaken largely with the object of showing how changing problems growing up out of varying conditions have been met by the architects of the past. The degree of success with which the problems have been tackled should be carefully noted, and special attention should be drawn to the differences between modern conditions in England and those of other countries and other days. Measured drawings should be far more serious matters than they have usually been in the past; they should be genuine studies of worthy buildings, studies which will be of value to the student who makes them, and which will, because of their absolute accuracy, be of real value as records.

Design should be in some measure a kind of sum of the above studies. In each case there should be a definite and serious attempt to solve in every detail a real problem, and the success of the effort should be measured not by the general appearance of the drawing or by the skill with which the student has avoided the real issue, but by the degree to which, if constructed, it would prove a satisfactory solution of the problem.

If we take up the work of architectural education in this deeper and more serious manner, we shall not ask which school can do the designs for the R.I.B.A. Final in the first or second term, but which school is carrying out the most serious investigations, and which school is helping to make the men best fitted to tackle the varying problems which will be put before them in after years. We shall not worry because it is not possible to carry out studies on the suggested lines in three years, but we shall agree that certain studies are essential, and devote the necessary time—probably five years—to them.

If we are anxious that our profession shall receive the recognition given to other professions, we should not begrudge the making of similar sacrifice. The



Medical course is five years in length, and I see no reason why ours should be shorter. The more fully we realise the importance of thoroughness in our studies the more completely we shall appreciate the value of the University Schools of Architecture. For hardly anywhere else can the student get from men of standing the increasingly necessary teaching in pure and applied science, and the equally necessary contact with students who are *not* taking a course in architecture.

A further point raised in the recent conferences is the important one of educating not ourselves, but the public. The R.I.B.A. should certainly appoint a committee to consider this matter. Its investigations would soon show that the Press is perfectly willing to help, providing suitable "copy" is produced by the architects, and that the public is keenly interested in architecture if it is treated as a living art which is now, as it was in the past, an integral part of civilisation.

### THE EDUCATION OF THE ARCHITECT.

ON reading, in the September issue of the JOURNAL, the report of the discussion on the Education of the Architect, at the Seventh Informal Conference, held on the 2nd of May, I feel tempted to offer a remark or two, belated though these must be.

Both Professor Pite and Professor Dickie, speaking in anticipation of coming changes and reform in the administration of educational affairs by the Institute, advocated the better recognition by the Examination authorities of the teaching bodies throughout the country, and closer consideration of their needs and difficulties in connection with the educational work they are doing for the profession. Both professors intimate how completely the freedom of the schools has come to lie at the mercy of the Institute rulers, from whose decrees the schools have no appeal. Certainly the instance brought forward by Professor Dickie, concerning the Manchester School of Architecture, is almost startling; and Manchester can hardly be singular in such experience. Surely it is getting a little late in the day for a non-teaching authority to remain free to overrule and cripple the activities of organisations that are actually engaged in doing the sorely needed work of teaching.

Professor Dickie is charitable enough to speak of the Institute as robbing the schools unconsciously; but does this mend matters? As it must be admitted that the teaching bodies who are charged with the essential work of architectural education throughout the country are deserving of fair play, at least, we can but hope that at length our rulers are in course of recovering consciousness.

I suppose that all of us who, in times gone by, ever lifted a little finger to help in the work of the R.I.B.A. Examinations have been sustained in our poor efforts by the hope that thus we might be doing our "bit" in

the cause of architectural education. Even supposing, for the sake of argument, that we were mistaken, yet we could not have contemplated the crippling of teaching. To be sure, before the general establishment of architectural schools throughout the country it was, only too often, a case of examining the untaught; but, with the schools now in existence, we ought to be able to say henceforth at any rate that the Examination is made for the schools, not the schools for the Examination.

The consensus of opinion expressed at the meeting seems to show that the time is ripe for an architectural Headmasters' conference, as suggested by Professor Simpson. Let the profession hear from the men engaged in the work of training our recruits what they collectively have to say on their own subject.

WALTER MILLARD [A.].

### CORRESPONDENCE.

#### "The Comacine Builders."

*Briantercroft, Milford-on-Sea, Hants: 3rd October, 1917.*

To the Editor, JOURNAL R.I.B.A.—

DEAR SIR,—In your issue for September Sir Thomas Jackson reviews Mr. Porter's work on Lombard Architecture, and I extract the following from his criticism. "Mr. Porter, I am happy to find, does not accept the myth of the Comacine builders. It depends mainly on an edict of King Rotharis in 643, addressed to the Magistri Comacini, relating to liability for accidents arising from building. To suppose, as some have done, that a little islet in Lake Como, the Insula Comacina, was at one time the refuge of all the polite arts of Italy, is ridiculous."

If Sir Thomas Jackson refers to the last part of this quotation as "the myth of the Comacine builders," I can only say I was not aware that anybody supposes such a thing, or lays any stress on the edict of Rotharis beyond that in it the Magistri Comacini are first mentioned by name. But if he refers to the influence exercised by the Comacines over a large part of Italy, Western Europe, and even our own land, then I can only regret he should find it necessary or desirable to characterise it as a "myth" and to rejoice in Mr. Porter's share in that view. As yet I have not seen Mr. Porter's book, but since my little book on the Comacines was published in 1910 I have made these men my chief study both in Italy and elsewhere, and I have such a collection of notes as justify me in saying the word "myth" in this application is at least unfortunate. And I have also the personal testimony of other students, whose research has been carried farther than mine, notably of Professor Ugo Monneret de Villard, the archaeologist appointed by the Italian Government to conduct explorations on Isola Comacina, to the very real influence of the Comacines on the architecture of Italy and the West of Europe.

I am aware that any extensive claim for this somewhat traverses the position of those who hold to a strong Byzantine influence in Italy; but as I hope some day to publish my further notes on the subject I will not trouble you with any remarks on this point now.

Yours truly,

W. RAVENSCROFT [F.].

## REVIEWS.

### THE ITALIAN ORDERS.

*The Italian Orders of Architecture.* By Charles Gourlay, B.Sc. 40. Lond. 1917. 6s. [Edward Arnold.]

In a sub-title, Professor Gourlay describes this work as a "Practical Book for the use of Architects and Craftsmen," and in the Preface further states his aim as being the provision of a text-book for the use of beginners as well as for reference by architects when designing and by craftsmen when executing work, while further commending it to the attention of engineers and surveyors. The contents justify the description; the author's aim is adequately achieved, especially in view of the very moderate price at which the book is issued. It contains 32 plates, 12 inches by 9 inches, Preface, Introduction and text extending to 29 pages, the latter comprising, not only a clear analysis and description of the plates, but a Foreword giving general directions for the proper setting out of drawings and other information especially useful to those students—fortunately a rapidly diminishing number—who are debarred by their circumstances from attendance at a properly constituted School of Architecture. In this, as throughout the work, it benefits by the large experience of the author as Professor of Architecture and Building at the Royal Technical College of Glasgow, though exception may be taken to the professorial inclusion, if only as being beyond the scope of an elementary treatise, of *ex cathedra* definitions, more or less debatable, regarding the broader issues contained in such expressions as Architecture, Style, Scale and Proportion.

The plates show the various Orders, from Tuscan to Composite, in full proportions as associated in colonnades, or, more frequently, combined with arched construction, also in their several details, with an added series giving balustrades, windows and doorways, ceilings, etc., all very clearly drawn and reproduced in outline only. A point not infrequently overlooked in such works has in this been rightly emphasised, namely, the consideration of the stone jointing. In this connection the fact that the bottom fillet is attached to and forms part of the shaft, while rightly shown on the plates, might with advantage have been specially noted in the text in view of the not uncommon error of placing the joint above it.

A point of more importance is the omission of all reference to the use of the entablature with the frieze eliminated, as frequently employed by the Italian

masters, as, for instance, by San Gallo in the order of the vestibule and courtyard of the Farnese Palace, also in that of the Massimi Palace by Peruzzi, and frequently to be preferred in interior design. An example of this treatment to a small scale is, indeed, included in the secondary orders of the Basilica of Vicenza, an interesting elevation of which to illustrate the superposition of arcades is provided on plate 29, but otherwise no description or drawing of the arrangement is given, while the entablature in question is somewhat misleadingly described in the text as an instance of a specially low proportion in relation to the column supporting it, without mention of the manner in which the result is achieved.

As explained in the preface, Professor Gourlay has based his rendering of the Orders on those formerly set forth by various acknowledged masters, Italian and English, without adhering to any one. The results generally are satisfactory, though the architect experienced in the handling of such traditional motives may not always find himself in accord with all the author's details. In some cases the latter finds himself unable to supply definite rules in view of the divergence of his authorities, and falls back on the statement, repeated several times in the text, that such matters depend "on the taste of the designer." A dangerous doctrine, surely, this (besides savouring somewhat of the cookery-book) to be set forth in a book addressed mainly to students. "Taste, sir," said Dr. Johnson—or words to that effect—"this is not a matter of taste, but of knowledge, sir, and of ignorance."

Apart from such minor criticisms and suggestions, the book is one to be warmly commended, not only to those making their first essays in design but to all interested in the traditional development of civil architecture, and one which, after careful study of its pages, the writer is glad to have included in his collection.

ALEXANDER N. PATERSON [F.].

### Canadian Timbers for Structural Purposes.

From the Department of Trade and Commerce, Canada, has been received a pamphlet on *Canadian Woods for Structural Timbers*, prepared at the Forest Products Laboratories under the auspices of the Forestry Branch of the Department of the Interior, Canada. The work is the outcome of an investigation, conducted in co-operation with McGill University, into the qualities of the woods of the various species of trees in Canada, with the object of affording reliable and authoritative information as to the strength, durability and other qualities of Canadian wood and their adaptability for use in structural work and manufactures of various kinds. Mr. Harrison Watson, Canadian Government Trade Commissioner, writes that he will be happy to forward a copy to any member of the Institute who will write to him at his office, 73, Basinghall Street, E.C.2.

# THE LATE LIEUT.-COL. VICTOR FLOWER, D.S.O. [*Licentiate*].

I AM happy in having the opportunity to add a few facts and dates to the short notice of Colonel Victor Flower which appeared in the last number of our JOURNAL. But in sitting down to put these records together I feel how strangely inadequate is any mere chronicle of events to tell the story of a life at once so pathetically short and so complete in achievement.

Good soldiers, I suppose, are born, not made; to many of them in times of peace the announcement of their birth as soldiers never comes. To many in these days of war it has come with a surprise and with amazing pleasure. To our friend Flower there came, as I hope, the pleasure of this discovery but perhaps not the full measure of surprise, for the life of military discipline had always been to him one of the happy interests of his earlier manhood, and it was owing to his industrious work as a capable volunteer that when the war broke out he entered the London Regiment with a commission as Captain, having already laid the foundation of his brief and brilliant career as a soldier on active service.

It was in January of 1876 and in Westminster Abbey that Victor Augustine Flower was baptised by Dean Stanley, the Dean himself and Lady Augusta Stanley being two of his sponsors. He was the third son, as already related, of Sir William Henry Flower, K.C.B., the talented zoologist, who in early life saw active military service as an army surgeon in the Crimean War and whose later years were so successfully employed in the control (1884-1898) of the Natural History Museum. Colonel Flower's mother, still living, was Georgiana Rosetta, daughter of Admiral Smyth. His first school was Eagle House, Sandhurst, and he went thence in September 1889 to Morshead's House at Winchester. His time as a Wykehamist must have been somewhat shortened by a desire to get to the business of life, for he left the school in December 1892 and was for a time engaged in engineering studies. His first definite architectural training was in the office of his brother—an old friend of my own—Arthur Smyth Flower, who had been a pupil in my father's office; and Victor, after a short spell of work with Prof. Roger Smith, finished his architectural preparation by coming to us. It was in the years 1895 and 1897 that he worked in the office, and I find on looking up the records that he was engaged on drawings for some seven or eight different buildings. Two of them were hospital works and two others college buildings. He was not a pupil, but came for experience. I feel not a little proud to think that our period of friendship at 20 New Cavendish Street entitles me to reckon this distinguished soldier as among the little band of fighters who have gone out from the Waterhouse office. How well I remember his tall figure, his mature dignified face, his steady work and his quiet manner. How little I then foresaw

the distinction, the renown and the success that were to come to him in a line of work so unlike architecture—and yet like; for the architect is a master craftsman, and it was as a controller of the craftsmen of war that he put honour to his name and to the dear name of England.

A few years after leaving our office Flower had an opening in the firm of Swan & Maclaren at Singapore, and he joined them in February 1900. His career there was not merely successful professionally but gave him many opportunities for various sports and athletic exercises in which he was proficient.

On the 21st May, 1914, after his return to England, Flower married Winifride, youngest daughter of Sir Digby Pigott, C.B., an event which seemed at the time to presage the opening of a settled and successful life in England, but which, as events proved, added to the pathos and to the heroism of his ready response to the call of his country.

The opening of the war coming upon him at the age of thirty-eight found him younger than many of his juniors in physical strength and indomitable energy. The chance of actual soldiering, and the sudden call for trained men, were not appeals to which he of all people could be indifferent. He was but newly and very happily established in married life in England, yet professional prospects and home ties were unselfishly set aside and it was in a battalion of the London Regiment that he found himself gazetted as Captain. His powers as an officer were at once apparent, and promotion was correspondingly rapid. In the autumn of 1915 he was transferred to another battalion and went out to France with the rank of Major. By December of the same year he had been gazetted Lieut.-Colonel. He was twice mentioned in Despatches and received the D.S.O. He was at the Front continuously till January last, when he was invalided home. After his recovery he was appointed to the command of his original battalion and returned to France. The officers and men of his old battalion, as well as those who served with him in the new, hold in warmest reverence the memory of his fine character as an officer. One who knew him well spoke of him as possessing the "essential qualities of a commanding officer" more than anyone he knew. His death must have occurred on the 15th August; he was killed instantaneously by a shell while watching his men move out to a relief—those men who thought so highly of him.

"He was thought a great deal of by the Major-General and his Brigadier": this was proudly admitted by some of his regimental friends with a touching reservation that their own affectionate opinion of him was closer and more intimate. "Mourned by all ranks in the unit," said one, and "an exceptionally strong, clear-headed soldier."

There was a pathetic rivalry between the battalions in the care of his grave. His newer comrades having erected a cross, the old friends came and put a railing round it.

Can one think of a broken column as symbolising such a death? I hardly think so. The end of that life was no ragged breaking off, but rather the triumphant placing upon base and shaft of a capital unexpected perhaps in form but showing when set in position the perfect whole for which shaft and base were all unknowingly devised. *Finis coronat opus.*

PAUL WATERHOUSE [F.].

### THE LATE 2ND LT. C. J. M. COWDELL [A.].

"Blow out you bugles over the Rich Dead."

On the 12th September there passed to join the great company of the glorious dead Charles Joseph Morton Cowdell, killed by shell fire whilst in the execution of his duty as an officer of Engineers on the blood-drenched fields of France. One of the first to answer the country's call for men, he eagerly undertook the great adventure and joined in the September of three years ago the Universities and Public Schools Battalion as a private. With them, having undergone the lengthy training to which they were submitted, he served in the trenches in France. Later, receiving a Commission in the Leicestershire Regiment, he took part in heavy fighting during last year's offensives. Then came a special course of instruction in England, after which he was transferred as Second Lieutenant to the Royal Engineers, and again proceeded to France on the service in which he has given his life. In him the Engineers lose a most capable Officer and the Institute an Associate of promise. From the Wyggeston School at Leicester he had passed to the office of his father, Mr. W. M. Cowdell [F.], in that city. During his five years there as a pupil he was a successful student and prizeman in the Leicester School of Art. A clever draughtsman and keen sketcher, as the result of various expeditions chiefly in the West of England and in France he on several occasions won prizes for sketches offered by the Leicestershire Society of Architects; he was also a bronze medallist of the Science and Art Department, South Kensington, in Architectural Design, and in the Institute Final Examination had taken a very high place. Later he spent some years in gaining varied experience in the offices of other firms, amongst which were those of Messrs. Heazell & Sons, of Nottingham, and Messrs. Bradshaw, Gass & Hope, of Bolton, the latter of which he left to join the Army. He was elected Associate of the Institute in 1912.

A young man on the threshold of his career, gifted, and with a mind well stored for the practice of his craft, a capable workman and with fine artistic sense, his friends had great hopes for his future. But high though these were, it is for himself—for his lovable personal qualities—that they mourn him most. His honest uprightness, his kindness of heart, his whimsical sense of humour, his loyal friendliness and thoughtfulness for others—the simplest, though by no means the most common, virtues of life—these brought him the deep respect and regard of his

fellows. Can one say more than that C. J. M. Cowdell was in the best and truest sense of the much-worn words an "officer and a gentleman"?

JOHN B. GASS [F.].



9 CONDUIT STREET, LONDON, W., 20th October 1917.

### CHRONICLE.

#### The R.I.B.A. Record of Honour: Forty-eighth List.

##### *Fallen in the War.*

BARKER, Private THOMAS CHRISTOPHER, Yorks Regiment, Member of the Scarborough Town Council [*Licentiate*]. Accidentally killed at the Front on 4th August. Aged thirty-six.

COWDELL, 2nd Lieut. CHARLES JOSEPH MORTON, Royal Engineers [*Associate*, 1912]. Killed in action on 12th September. Son of Mr. William M. Cowdell [F.], of Leicester.

GARRATT, EDWARD [*Licentiate*, *Pugin Student*, 1905]. Killed serving at his battery in Flanders on 11th September.

HILL, Staff - Sergeant CLAUDE EDGAR, R.A.M.C. [*Associate*]. Killed in action on 3rd September.

MOODIE, 2nd Lieut. JOHN [*Student*, 1908], Seaforth Highlanders. Died of wounds in France, 27th August 1917.

Second Lieut. Moodie received his architectural training principally at King's College, London, and, after experience in various offices, was assisting Mr. Alan Brace, of Old Buildings, Lincoln's Inn, when war broke out. In the spring of 1915 he joined the London Scottish, subsequently took the Cadets' course at Trinity College, Cambridge, and received a Commission in the Seaforth Highlanders. After three months' active service in France (Somme district) in 1916 he was invalided home with trench fever, and later operated upon for appendicitis. Returning to France upon his recovery he took part in an action on the 22nd August, 1917 (his 30th birthday), receiving two bullet wounds, from which he died in hospital five days later. He worthily upheld the honourable traditions of his family, and his strong, manly qualities, attached to an amiable disposition, cause his loss to be much deplored by his friends.—FREDK. R. HORNES [A.].

##### *Members' Sons.*

DINWIDDY, Major CONRAD HUGH, Royal Garrison Artillery. Died of wounds, aged thirty-six. Fifth son of Mr. Thomas Dinwiddy [F.]. Mr.





Lt.-Col. VICTOR FLOWER, D.S.O., *Licentiate*.  
London Regiment.  
Killed in action (see p. 279).



2nd Lieut. WILLIAM WYLIE HOUSTON, *Associate*.  
Royal Engineers.  
Killed in action (see p. 267).



Private THOMAS CHRISTOPHER BARKER, *Licentiate*.  
Yorkshire Regiment.  
(Formerly Scarborough Town Councillor.)  
Accidentally killed at the Front (see p. 280).



2nd Lt. CHARLES JOSEPH MORTON COWDELL,  
*Associate*. Royal Engineers.  
Killed in action (see p. 280).

Dinwiddy has still three sons in the Services—Commander Dinwiddy, R.N., Major Malcolm Dinwiddy, Royal West Kent Regiment, and Lieut. Norman Dinwiddy, R.N.V.R. [F.].

BATH, Staff-Sergeant LESLIE VIVIAN HURLE, R.F.A. Killed in action in France on 23rd August. Youngest son of Mr. Fred Bath [F.], of Salisbury.

#### *Military Honours.*

FISHER, Captain STANLEY HOWE, R.E. [A.], has been mentioned three times in Despatches, and has been awarded the Military Cross.

#### *Serving with the Forces.*

Intimation has been received that the following are serving, bringing the total to 77 Fellows, 532 Associates, 330 Licentiates, and 298 Students:—

#### FELLOWS.

Healey, A. J.: Machine Gun Corps Motors.

#### ASSOCIATES.

Black, Herbert: Australian Engineers.  
Harrison, J. A.: Canadian Engineers.  
Mackenzie, H. B.: 2nd Lieut., Royal Engineers.  
Wade, F. W.: 2nd Lieut., Royal Engineers.  
Stretton, Clement: Royal Naval Air Service.  
Conder, A. R.: 2nd Lieut., Equipment Officer, R.F.C.

#### LICENTIATES.

Cheetham, H.: Royal Engineers.  
Barbour, John: R.F.A.  
Horne, D. E. A.: Lieut., Labour Corps.

#### *Promotions.*

Mr. F. C. S. Harrison [Student] has been gazetted 2nd Lieut., Durham Light Infantry.

Mr. J. H. Chalkley [Student], late of the London Regt., has been gazetted 2nd Lieut., Machine Gun Corps.

2nd Lieut. L. Sylvester Sullivan [A.] transferred from the Royal West Surrey Regiment to the Labour Corps in April last and is now Acting Captain.

Mr. Harry R. Finn [Licentiate], who joined the Royal Engineers as a Sapper in July 1916, was granted a commission as 2nd Lieut. in January 1917 and was recently promoted to Lieutenant.

Mr. Charles Woodward [A.], son of Mr. William Woodward [F.], has been gazetted 2nd Lieut., Army Service Corps.

#### *The Future of Architecture.*

Mr. John B. Gass [F.] discussing the future of architecture in his Presidential Address to the Manchester Society, said:—

As democracy will rule, the fostering of a rightly informed and cultivated mind among the people will bring about a true civic spirit, which will stir up amongst the inhabitants a pride in their cities, towns and villages and be of incalculable value for the future of architecture. To the children, architecture and history should be taught together in all the schools as part of the general educational course, for history is expressed in architecture, and both would be made more interesting and living by a true combination. The future would be more hopeful by understanding minds then seeing the expression of their own time in the buildings growing up around them, and by the insistence on the expression being right and true. The

Institute's Memorial of July last to the President of the Board of Education is one of the marks of the awakening spirit in our midst. It welcomes and urges the encouragement of the natural activities of eye and hand in the teaching of our day schools. It specially asks that all should be taught to draw, that provision should be made for manual work, and that comprehension of the common duties of life should be infused into their minds; that a town spirit should be inculcated as the best basis on which to build up a national spirit, and that something should be done to bring out the idea of design and strengthen initiative in the minds of the children. With a democracy truly educated in that spirit, and profiting by it, all things grow possible; thought's range gives a wider scope than now with the narrow view which prevails. Citizenship will have a real meaning and the communal feeling be more fully developed in the civilisation of the coming time. A sense of the values of surroundings in the minds of the people for their living, their education, their work, their religion, and their pleasures will infuse life into architecture which will then dare to confront and break through the old and the time-endured while profiting by their good examples.

The higher the outlook of the nation the greater the training and skill required by those who express it in the architecture of the time. For our profession to hold its place in the ever-quickening march of events, a general high standard will be even more necessary than at present. All endeavour must be made to make the profession of architecture attractive to the best of the young men of the nation, and then see that the highest special educational facilities are placed within the reach of those who can profit by them; for on the ability of the student to profit by special education depends the success of that education and its practical value in the world. There have recently been discussions at the Institute on architectural education which have been very interesting. The virile suggestions from the Architectural Association School have an artistic as well as a practical outlook on the present and on the future, rather than the over-worship at the shrine of the past. It was well stated that schemes of architectural education will always remain schemes unless they coincide fairly with the sense of values of the nation at large, and also that the constructive side and artistic side of education should be run together. With both of these statements I am in full agreement. Many of the speakers, however, dealt mainly with the theoretical, both artistic and scientific, part of professional training, which is only the beginning of an architect's education. Little was said of the vital necessity of a thorough training in the practical and business side of our profession, the only way to make a college or special school education of the real help in a man's career that it ought to be, and preventing his having a true and not a false sense of values. An architect has to be in touch with actualities, and the use of practical common sense with experience are essential to a successful career. My personal experience of college-trained youths is not very convincing unless such training has been simultaneous with office work, when it is of the greatest help and leads to efficiency. It is probable that the education of the future will have to take into account the State and military service which will be required from our young men at the most impressionable and valuable time of their lives; one, two or three years from the age of about eighteen. In the future arrangements of State service consideration should be given to students in all the learned professions so as to make their specialised training of value to the State. The effectiveness of the scheme of architectural education and the personal capacity of the students will be important factors in determining how far such consideration will be given to our profession and maintained. The branch of State or military service which will utilise the specialised preliminary training and enable our students to take it forward should be organised in the national interests. . . .



2nd Lieut. CECIL LAWRENCE WRIGHT, *Associate*  
Royal Garrison Artillery.  
Killed in action (see p. 241).



Captain CHARLES WILLIAM EATON, *Associate*.  
Leicester Regiment.  
Died of wounds (see p. 241).



Lance-Corp. DAVID LANG MEIKLEHAM, *Associate*.  
Royal Engineers.  
Killed in action (see p. 267).



2nd Lieut. JOHN HARDY WILSON, *Licentiate*.  
Sherwood Foresters.  
Killed in action (see p. 267).



### Housing Problems after the War.

Under the auspices of the University of London, Professor S. D. Adshead [F.] will deliver at University College, Gower Street, on Tuesdays at 5 p.m., beginning 6th November, six public lectures, illustrated by lantern slides, on Housing Problems after the War. At the first lecture the Chair will be taken by the Right Hon. Christopher Addison, M.P., Minister of Reconstruction. Application for tickets, accompanied by a stamped and addressed envelope, should be made to the Secretary, Mr. Walter W. Seton, D.Lit., at University College.

## NOTICES.

The President's Opening Address, 5th November.

THE FIRST GENERAL MEETING (ORDINARY) of the Session 1917-18 will be held Monday, 5th November 1917, when the Chair will be taken by the President, Mr. Henry T. Hare, at THREE P.M. precisely, for the following purposes:—

To read the Minutes of the General Meeting (Ordinary) held Monday, 25th June; to announce the names of candidates for membership; formally to admit members attending for the first time since their election;

Mr. HENRY T. HARE, President, to deliver

THE OPENING ADDRESS OF THE SESSION.

Election of Members, 3rd December.

Application for election in the classes indicated have been received from the undermentioned gentlemen. Notice of any objection or other communication respecting them must be sent to the Secretary R.I.B.A. for submission to the Council prior to Monday, 5th November.

AS FELLOWS (10).

CRANFIELD: SYDNEY WHITE [Associate, 1892], 14 Gray's Inn Square, W.C. Now serving with the Colours.  
*Proposers:* Edwin Cooper, Henry V. Ashley, and Fred. W. Marks.

\*HARVEY: WILLIAM ALEXANDER [Licentiate], 5 Bennett's Hill, and Linden Road, Bournville, Birmingham.  
*Proposers:* Ernest Newton, Arthur Keen, Chas. E. Bateman.

\*JONES, FRANCIS [Licentiate], 178 Oxford Road, Manchester; and Blackcraig, Knutsford.  
*Proposers:* Percy S. Worthington, Isaac Taylor, and Paul Ogden.

\*MORRISH: WILLIAM JAMES MARMADUKE [Licentiate], Wyke Road, Gillingham, Dorset.  
*Proposers:* Charles B. Pearson, Charles T. Miles, and the Council.

NICOL: GEORGE SALWAY [Associate, 1903], King's Court, 117 Colmore Row, Birmingham; and "Manresa," Vernon Road, Edgbaston.

*Proposers:* Chas. E. Bateman, Arthur Harrison, and Alfred W. S. Cross.

NICOL: JOHN COULSON [Associate, 1887], King's Court, Colmore Row, Birmingham; and Elmdon Lodge, Acocks Green, Birmingham.

*Proposers:* Arthur Harrison, John P. Osborne, and Alfred W. S. Cross.

\*POWELL: ROBERT SIDNEY [Licentiate], 11 St. Mark's Square, N.W.  
*Proposers:* John Hudson, Fred. W. Hunt, and Arthur Ashbridge.

\*RUTHEN: CHARLES TAMLIN [Licentiate], 5 Northampton Gardens, Swansea.

*Proposers:* Ernest Newton, Henry T. Hare, and E. Vincent Harris.

SMALLMAN: HENRY RICHARD GEORGE STRONG [Associate, 1905], 8 Queen Street, Cheapside, E.C.; "Kemer-ton," Rosebery Road, Sutton, Surrey.

*Proposers:* H. D. Searles-Wood, J. Douglass Mathews, and Henry T. Gordon.

TICKLE: ARTHUR GEORGE WARNHAM [Associate, 1911], Public Works Department, Hong Kong.

*Proposers:* Sir Aston Webb, R.A., Sidney Perks, and J. Douglass Mathews.

\* These candidates have passed the Examination qualifying for candidature as Fellows.

As ASSOCIATES (5).

BEESTON: HUMPHREY ALBERT [Student, 1904], State Buildings, East Division, P.W.M., Cairo, Egypt; and 9 Sharia Kasr-el-Nilm, Cairo.

*Proposers:* Frederick Chatterton, Robert Williams, and the Council.

COATES: HAROLD FENWICK [Special Examination], 47 Queen Street, Melbourne, Australia.

*Proposers:* W. A. M. Blackett, Edward A. Bates, and H. W. Tomkins.

HENRIQUES: ELIAS COSMAS [Special Examination], Bombay, India; and 21 Cromwell Road, South Kensington, London, S.W.1.

*Proposers:* Charles E. Varndell, James Ransome, and Robert Atkinson.

HOPE: ARCHIBALD CAMPBELL [Special Examination], 70 Howard Park Avenue, Toronto, Ontario, Canada.

*Proposers:* F. S. Baker, W. E. Vernon Crompton, and W. J. Morley.

RAYSON: THOMAS [Special Examination], H.M. Office of Works; and 179 Park Lane, Tottenham, N.17.

*Proposers:* N. W. Harrison, Alfred W. S. Cross, and Professor Beresford Pite.

### Arrangements for the Session, 1917-18.

INFORMAL CONFERENCES, AT 3 P.M.—

1. 22nd Nov.—The Function of an Architectural Society. *Opener*, Mr. Sidney Webb; *Chairman*, Mr. Henry T. Hare, President.

2. 5th Dec.—Unity of the Profession. *Opener*, Professor F. M. Simpson [F.]; *Chairman*, Professor W. R. Lethaby [F.].

3. 9th Jan. 1918.—Co-operation amongst Architects, and Specialisation. *Opener*, Mr. H. V. Lanchester; *Chairman*, Professor Beresford Pite [F.].

4. 13th Feb.—National Policy of Town Improvement (Conference with Public Men and Writers). *Opener*, Mr. Clutton Brock; *Chairman*, Sir Aston Webb, K.C.V.O., C.B., R.A. [F.].

5. 13th March.—National Housing and National Life. *Opener*, Professor Adshead [F.]; *Chairman*, Mr. W. R. Davidge [A.].

6. 10th April.—Relations of Architecture and Engineering (Conference with Engineers). *Opener*, Professor W. R. Lethaby.

7. 8th May.—Quality of Work and the Present System of Competitive Tendering (Conference with Builders and Workmen). *Opener*, Sir J. J. Burnet, R.S.A., LL.D. [F.]; *Chairman*, Mr. H. V. Lanchester [F.].

8. 12th June.—Proposed Parliament of Building Trades.

### Contents of this Issue.

	PAGE
Co-operation in Design [A. R. Jenmett, A. W. S. Cross, H. V. Lanchester, Professor Lethaby, Robert Atkinson, D. B. Niven]	269
Architectural Education for Architects and the Public [W. S. Purchon]	276
The Education of the Architect [Walter Millard]	277
"The Comacine Builders" [W. Ravenscroft]	277
Reviews.—The Italian Orders [Alex. N. Paterson]	278
The late Lt.-Col. Victor Flower, D.S.O. [Paul Waterhouse]	279
The late 2nd Lieut. C. J. M. Cowdell [John B. Gass]	280
Chronicle.—The R.I.B.A. Record of Honour: The Future of Architecture: Housing Problems After the War	281
Title-pages and Index to Vol. XXIV.	i-viii
Summary of the Year's Additions to the Library	ix



